

REMARKS

This Application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 23, 2011. Claims 1-78 were previously cancelled. Claims 79, 81, 89, 90, and 94 are currently amended herein. New claim 97 is added herein. Thus, claims 79-82 and 85-97 are pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit no new matter is added by the present amendments. Support for the present amendments is found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example on page 11, lines 1-9. Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview Summary

On August 17, 2011, Applicants' representative Joseph Walker conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Charles Agwumezie, for which we express our thanks. During the interview the finality of the Office Action dated February 23, 2011 was discussed. The Examiner agreed that the Office Action dated February 23, 2011 is a Non-Final Office Action. The Examiner stated that box 2a in the Office Action Summary indicating the Office Action as FINAL was inadvertently checked and that the Office Action dated February 23, 2011 is in fact a Non-Final Office Action. The Examiner agreed to issue an Interview Summary on August 17, 2011 summarizing the interview and indicating that the Office Action dated February 23, 2011 is Non-Final.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 79-82 and 85-88 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 79 is currently amended herein to incorporate a computer to overcome this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit no new matter is added by the present amendments. Support for the present amendments is found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example the specification is replete with the references to computer networks.

Applicant respectfully submits that the currently amended claims are directed to statutory subject matter in their amended form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 79-82 and 85-88 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 79-82, and 85-96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,106, “Walker”) in view of Messner (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,514, “Messner”) and further in view of Scroggie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,634, “Scroggie”).

Applicants have amended independent claims 79, 89, and 90 herein. As amended independent claim 79, which is representative of amended independent claims 89 and 90, recites: “...storing...image data designated by at least one of said plurality of subscriber retailers, said image data being based upon terms and conditions specific to said at least one subscriber retailer;...accessing...said image data to determine an appearance of said prepaid voucher for said selected subscriber retailer...[and]...generating...an image including said image data in response to receiving said order...”

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 79-82, and 85-96 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is moot in view of Applicants’ claim amendments. Specifically, neither Walker nor Messner make any mention of “...storing...image data designated by at least one of said plurality of subscriber retailers, said image data being based upon terms and conditions specific to said at least one subscriber retailer...,” “...accessing...said image data to determine an appearance of said prepaid voucher for said selected subscriber retailer...” or “...generating...an image including said image data in response to receiving said order...” The Examiner have even acknowledged that “Walker failed to explicitly disclose...said at least one database including voucher image data for said prepaid voucher...generation of a voucher image associated with said prepaid voucher in accordance with said voucher image data...[and]...said voucher image is associated with each of said plurality of subscribing retailers.” (Office Action, pp. 12-13).

Scroggie does not cure the deficiencies of Walker and Messner. Scroggie does not disclose or suggest at least "...storing...image data designated by at least one of said plurality of subscriber retailers, said image data being based upon terms and conditions specific to said at least one subscriber retailer..." Scroggie discloses "...the coupons distributed over the Internet in accordance with the present invention, are created in real time to include information provided by the consumer at his or her remote location." (Scroggie, col. 10, lines 28-31). According to Scroggie, "...the input information that has to be incorporated into each coupon includes: The consumer's name and the location coordinates for location on the coupon, The coupon expiration date and its coordinates, The logo of the system and its coordinates, The product offer icon and its coordinates, The amount of savings and its coordinates, The terms for receiving savings amount and its coordinates, The legal text and its coordinates, The redemption text and its coordinates, The coupon sequence number and its coordinates, The bar code numbers and their coordinates, The supermarket designation and its coordinates, and The coupon size and border parameters." (Scroggie, col. 10, lines 42-59). While Scroggie discloses input information that is incorporated into each coupon, the input information is provided by the consumer, and is not designated a subscriber retailer. Further, Scroggie makes no mention of the "...image data being based upon terms and conditions specific to said at least one subscriber retailer..."

Since none of Walker, Messner, and Scroggie or any combination of the cited references discloses or suggests each element of the amended independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If any points remain an issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned with any concerns in furtherance of the prosecution of the present application.

Please charge any deficiency as well as any other fee(s) which may become due at any time during the pendency of this application, or credit any overpayment of such fee(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-2896.

Respectfully submitted,

8/22/2011
Dated:

/Joseph P. Quinn/
Joseph P. Quinn (Reg. No. 45,029)
Customer No. 71130
Attorney for Applicant(s)
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
World Trade Center East
Two Seaport Lane, Suite 300
Boston, MA 02210
Tel: 617-946-4833
Fax: 617 946-4801
E-mail: bosippto@seyfarth.com